



**DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION  
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes – September 21, 2007**

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Patti L. TenBrook, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Reg. 9 (USEPA)  
Martha Harnly, Department of Public Health (CDPH-EHIB)  
Barry Wilson, University of California Department of Environmental Toxicology (UCD)  
Syed Ali, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)  
Rebecca Sisco, University of California IR-4 Program  
Anna Fan, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)  
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)  
Bryan Eya, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)  
Brian Larimore, Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMB)  
Barbara Todd, Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)  
Tobi Jones, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

Visitors in Attendance:

Ann Prichard, DPR  
Denise Webster, DPR  
Linda O'Connell, DPR  
Eileen Mahoney, DPR  
Jay Schreider, DPR  
Miglena Wilbur, DPR  
Louise Mehler, DPR  
Jeanne Martin, DPR  
Brian Bret, Dow Agro Sciences  
Nasser Dean, Western Plant Health Assn.  
Roberta Firoved, CA Rice Commission  
Paul Hann, Central Valley RWQCB  
Henry Buckwalter, Compliance Services  
Kathleen Haley, Inside CAL/EPA-newsletter  
Masuo Robinson, Robinson Assoc.  
Rupali Das, CDPH  
John Beckmans, CDPH  
Joy Wisniewski, OEHHA  
Marylou Verder-Carlos, OEHHA  
Kim Hensley, Environmental Solutions Group  
George Farnsworth, DPR

1. Introductions and Committee Business - Tobi Jones, Chairperson, DPR

- a. About 32 people attended the meeting.



- b. The committee did not identify any corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on May 18, 2007. However, a correction was made to the list of visitors after a visitor informed the Chair that he had been incorrectly listed as an attendee.

2. Occupational Pesticide Illness Reduction Activities in the California Department of Public Health – Rupali Das, M.D., California Department of Public Health

The Occupational Health Branch (OHB) in CDPH is a non-regulatory, public health program to reduce work-related injury & illness. Two initiatives guide OHB work, including those related to pesticides: (1) to evaluate and address the needs of underserved workers and (2) to promote the use of safer chemical alternatives to eliminate adverse effects to workers and the environment. OHB's program is part of the NIOSH pesticide program, Sentinel Event Notification System For Occupational Risk (SENSOR): Twelve states collaborate with each other and with CDC on data and methods to prevent pesticide illness and use shared standardized variables, case classification, and severity index. OHB's statewide pesticide illness tracking program, 1988-2007, was formerly named SENSOR and is now known as the Occupational Pesticide Illness Prevention Program (OPIPP). OPIPP's goal is to collect information to inform partners and to allow others to make changes to reduce pesticide illness. Recommendations are made to employers, workers, and regulatory agencies for illness prevention. From 1988-1993, OHB used active surveillance in Fresno County. From 1998-present, the system uses passive surveillance. Project components are: illness tracking, field investigations, and outreach/education. The primary source of reports is the mandatory Doctor's First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness (DFRs, 79% of reports); 39% of reports have a Pesticide Illness Report. In addition, medical records, investigation results, selected agricultural commissioner reports, etc. supplement primary data sources. From 1998-2005, OPIPP classified 2995 reports, resulting in 1410 occupational illness cases. The numbers of work-related illnesses dropped from 1998-2005, at least partly due to a drop in the number of DFRs collected. Only a minority of incidents that meet the OPIPP investigation criteria are investigated due to significant resource limitations. Field investigations include interviews of workers, employers, regulators, and others; a standardized questionnaire is used. Additional data sources include OSHA injury logs, medical records, industrial hygiene data, and agricultural commissioner reports. Examples of investigations include drift incidents, greenhouse exposures, and pesticide exposures to flight attendants aboard aircraft. Investigations make specific suggestions for the use of safer alternatives to pesticides, including non-pesticide agricultural methods, safer methods of applying pesticides, and workplace practices such as training. Physician education is an important part of OPIPP's work and includes the development of a curriculum on Pesticide Illness that is available on CD or online. Related projects include the San Luis Obispo County Farmworker Survey and a study that evaluated the utility of Laboratory Reporting of Cholinesterase Tests for Occupational Illness Tracking.

3. Report Impacts of AB1011 on Pesticide Registration Functions – Ann Prichard, Registration Branch

AB 1011 became effective January 1, 2006. The bill authorized DPR to register pesticide products based on evaluations of previously submitted data, regardless of ownership of that data. In addition, the bill required DPR to accept applications for registration of pesticide products containing new active ingredients concurrently with applicant's submission of an application to U.S. EPA for federal registration. The bill did not change DPR's data requirements. However, if an applicant subject to data cost sharing does not make an offer to pay to the data owner, its product's registration may be subject to cancellation.

If DPR previously approved one or more pesticide products containing the same active ingredient, and with the same or similar label claims (including application rate, pests, and sites), as are on the new product label then, no additional scientific evaluation will be conducted. If we find that only some of the claims on a new product were previously approved, then new product will need scientific evaluation of "new" (non-previously approved) claims.

In July 2007, Pesticide Registration Branch (PRB) completed an analysis of the impacts of AB 1011 on the registration process. Calendar year 2005 was compared to calendar year 2006. The PRB received 4479 submissions in 2006 and 4175 submissions in 2005. The result was an increase of 300 submission in 2006 or 7%. The total number of submissions requiring scientific evaluation dropped from 1,427 submissions requiring scientific evaluation in 2005 to 1,011 submissions requiring scientific evaluation in 2006, resulting in an overall 29% decrease in the number of products requiring scientific evaluation. The number of new active ingredient submissions submitted in 2006 increased by 26 submissions over 2005, from 46 to 72, an overall increase of 56%. Processing time for new active ingredient submissions decreased by 114 days, from 271 days in 2005 to 157 days in 2006, and overall decrease of 43%. Even though the number of submissions increased by 300 in 2006, overall processing time from receipt to final action decreased by 13.6 days (from 92.8 days for 2005 to 79.2 days for 2006), and overall decrease of 15%.

During the discussion, Ms. Prichard clarified that the similarity of formulation composition is one of the factors determining the need for scientific evaluation of new products.

4. Notification of Finalized List of Active Ingredients for Risk Assessment Initiation – Jay Schreider, Medical Toxicology Branch

Jay Schreider announced the release of the Final Notice on Active Ingredients Prioritized for Risk Assessment Initiation. A draft of the notice was presented to the Pesticide Registration and Evaluation Committee on March 16, 2007, and released for public comment on

May 23, 2007. Jay explained that following the close of the public comment period, the Risk Assessment Prioritization Work Group (RAPWG) met to discuss the comments and to consider any changes to the prioritization. The draft notice was updated along with the proposed responses to the submitted comments and circulated to the members of the RAPWG for concurrence. The final notice was then posted to DPR's web site at [http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/risk/final\\_notice.pdf](http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/risk/final_notice.pdf).

5. Update on Pyrethroids Reevaluation – Denise Webster, Registration Branch

Background

- Reevaluation was initiated August 31, 2006 (CA Notice 2006-13).
- Pyrethroids divided into three groups.
- In July 2007, new pesticide products were added into the reevaluation.

Update for Group I

- June 2007, manufacturers submitted certain environmental fate studies for prallethrin and resmethrin.
- August 2007, manufacturers submitted environmental fate studies on imiprothrin, d-allethrin, and phenothrin.

These environmental fate studies will be evaluated to determine if additional studies are needed similar to the Group III active ingredients.

Update for Group II

In January 2007, a registrant with products containing tau-fluvalinate requested a waiver from all of the data requirements for Group II active ingredients based on low use in California.

- In September 2007, DPR granted the waiver request based on agreement to place label mitigation developed for Group III active ingredients.

Update for Group III – Sediment Toxicity Data

Registrants of Group III active ingredients formed a data generating task force, called the Pyrethroid Working Group (PWG). Members of the PWG have committed to generate the data necessary to evaluate pyrethroid residues in sediment for those active ingredients in Group III.

- Sediment analytical method: The PWG submitted an analytical method in February and DPR approved this method in June of this year.
- Aerobic/anaerobic California sediment half-lives: In April, the PWG submitted a study protocol for review and approval. DPR scientists are currently evaluating this proposal.

Update for Group III – Off-Site Movement and Monitoring

- Off-site movement study protocols: In July, the PWG submitted an overview document and two study proposals. The first proposal investigated different landscape factors contributing to pyrethroid residues in two urban streams. The second study investigated efficiencies of sediment basins in agricultural settings. DPR requested stakeholder comments be submitted by October 19th.
- Monitoring in POTWs: In August, PWG met with members from Tri-TAC (DPR and the Water Board participated via conference call) whereby Tri-TAC provided information on wastewater treatment processes, and discussed their regulatory issues they face. PWG provided the meeting participants with the pyrethroid properties and likely fate in POTWs. This working group will jointly develop protocols to investigate the fate of permethrin in POTWs.

6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting- Tobi Jones, DPR

The next meeting will be held on Friday, November 16, 2007, in the Sierra Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

7. Closing Comments - Tobi Jones, DPR

The meeting was adjourned.